

"Well, Let Them."

We acknowledge our surprise at seeing some men in this part of the Union expressing gratification at what they construe to be the growing prospects of BEN. BUTLER for becoming Governor of Massachusetts. Remembering the detestation in which BUTLER was generally held through the South, it is astonishing that any should desire his elevation to public office, or even think him worthy to govern any body, or that there is any body of men so depraved as to deserve the terrible mortification of being governed by him. We all considered him the most impudent and cruel and the meanest and most dishonest of men. How can any of us desire to see him honored, or desire to see him put over any people? To do so would show shameful repudiation of noble principles, and the indulgence of a cruel vindictiveness toward fellow-beings who should receive our sympathy instead of being the victims of our malice.

Have we not enough of the evil nature of the tricks and contrivances of bad and cunning men in Virginia to inspire us with the most earnest desire that no people on earth should ever meet the calamity of falling under the rule of such men? Of all States, Virginia should best appreciate the disgrace of being governed by a wholly selfish and unscrupulous trickster, and should be the very last to desire to see BEN. BUTLER put over Massachusetts.

Why should we want to see the people of the Bay State suffer? It is a most unphilosophic idea that suggests the justice of afflicting communities through partisan contrivances. To the higher judgments which are due to many, and the humanitarian philosopher could not undertake to arouse or direct the wrath with which he has nothing to do, and which will neither come or depart at his bidding.

Mr. CLAY, in one of his loftiest and most generous moments, indignantly repudiated the idea that he could speak unkindly or harshly of communities. Of leaders and of parties he claimed the right to speak freely; but he did not think it just, and he could not speak harshly of people. In their hearts extend the principles which in the long run predominated and led to just conclusions. He was right. Mr. CLAY was a philanthropist, and there was the electric charm that bound him with the people, and men and communities cannot err in being governed by his just sentiment in this respect.

Now, why should we feel gratified in seeing the people of Massachusetts brought to the humiliation of being ruled by BEN. BUTLER? We cannot see why. There are bad people in Massachusetts, and God knows there are some of the vilest of men in Virginia. When we think of being vindictive and cruel to Massachusetts let us remember the shame that belongs to Virginia because of some disreputable men that have gotten into her councils, and that are continually disturbing the public peace and the public prospects by their agitations. We may hang our heads in regret, and feel a fresh sympathy for a people whose troubles and perils are so much like our own.

Massachusetts numbers some of the very best of men in her society, past and present. We may deplore that she has also Botwell the dog and Butler the monstrous beast; but from them we turn with delight to Judge Abbott, the ADAMSSES, and the host of good and great men who have adorned and still adorn the councils of one of the oldest and one of the most glorious of the original "thirteen" free and independent States.

Massachusetts deserves our sympathy and prayers that she may escape the disgrace of being governed by BUTLER, and we should hope and pray, too, that we, too, may be shielded from the cunning schemes of bad politicians, and that we may be able to preserve the honor and credit of the dear Old Dominion untainted by wicked rulers.

Let us hope that the number that rejoice in the signs of BUTLER'S success are few. But if they will so unwisely felicitate themselves, "why let them."

Two Important Matters.

Two very important matters that deserve the earnest consideration of our merchants and business-men are: a depot for cotton, together with a cotton-press, and, second, an elevator connected with the Chesapeake and Ohio railroad, to which other roads should have access.

The means for storing cotton and for putting it in the most convenient condition for shipment are needed especially now, because the Danville Railroad Company has just effected an arrangement by which it reaches Augusta, Ga., and may there control a large business in cotton. This is an addition to its power for transportation. It had before making this arrangement the route from Charlotte, N. C., to Atlanta, Ga. The two will throw upon the road a very large business—that is, if we make the necessary provision to accommodate it. We need never expect a large business in any branch of production unless the means to accommodate it are provided.

The deepening of the channel of the lower James has progressed in the most encouraging manner, and, although it is intended to deepen it still further, we have water enough now to enable us to ship all the produce of ten or eleven States whose near point of shipment for sea-going craft is Richmond.

We need hardly say that should such preparation be made in this city as to invite a large concentration of cotton here we shall certainly have a vast trade with the cotton-producing country. Besides, the business in cotton will stimulate to enterprises in the cotton line. There will spring up promptly a large cotton-manufacturing enterprise, which will add to Richmond a new and prosperous source of business, occupation, and of wealth.

So we should, if we appreciate properly our opportunities, have a cotton depot and a cotton-press as early as we can make them.

The grain-elevator is indispensable to that grain trade which we shall have the moment the western connections of the Chesapeake and Ohio railroad shall be completed. We can do no great business in grain unless there is an elevator. A cent, or even a fraction of a cent, controls freight, and without an elevator grain cannot be shifted at the lowest rates. If Richmond has not one, the trade will go any way to avoid Richmond.

Water for the Fair-Grounds.

We present before the earnest letter of Colonel KNIGHT, the secretary of the State Agricultural Society, urging upon the public and the Society the importance of having an abundant supply of fresh water for the Fair-Grounds during the exhibition. We commend what he says to the attention of all concerned.

OFFICE OF STATE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY, September 19, 1878.

Editors of Dispatch: You have well served the people of the State and the city of Richmond by your timely article in regard to this subject. It is no greater need at the State Fair-Grounds than an ample supply of water. It comes in for the comfort of visitors and the needs of exhibitors in many ways which it would be tedious to mention in detail. It would be laborious asking that a larger number of wells be dug for use at the next Fair. We have now a number of good wells, furnishing cool and clear water, which have been thoroughly cleaned and prepared for use, but still we fear the supply will be insufficient for the drinking water of people and animals, saying nothing of other uses by engines, hydraulic machines, fountains, dusting purposes, &c., which contribute to the practical purposes and comfort of a large crowd of people. New wells are needed for a variety of purposes. The city water-pipes leading from the new reservoir should be tapped at the nearest point, and the water introduced; and it should be done before the next Fair. There are many good reasons why it should be so, among which I may mention:

1. The grounds of the Society are not private but public property, and no private interests are involved.

2. The comforts of the grounds are enjoyed by the people of the State, and the greater extent by the citizens of Richmond.

3. The buildings and enclosures have been thoroughly repaired, repainted, and added to, so that they are now, or will be by the Fair, very attractive; and nothing seems to be needed except a full and convenient supply of water, as well as the proper exhibition of hydraulic machines as the physical comfort of people and animals.

4. The arrangements in contemplation by the officers of the Society as to the beautification of the grounds, and the free use of them by the people of the city of Richmond—present at least a claim on the city for its water supply.

Other reasons might be assigned, but in the haste of my present writing must hope that those given will be sufficient to cause the members of the Society in the city and the corporate authorities.

I may add that I hope it may be arranged for the pipe-trenches to be dug, under the authority of the Governor, by convicts from the penitentiary, and the city, with its engineer force, contribute to the cost of the pipe. The pipe needed will not exceed three inches, with some few branches of less diameter.

Your own article, Messrs. Editors, and what I have said in commendation of it, will, I trust, be sufficient to arrest the attention of the members of the Society in the city, and of other public-spirited citizens, and thus insure the influences necessary to give the water needed at the agricultural grounds of the State—cherished, as they should be, by the State and its capital city.

W. C. KNIGHT, Secretary.

In noticing the book "Roxey," by EDWARD EGLESTON, we said that he was a native of Virginia. We are informed that this is a mistake. Mr. EGLESTON is a native of Indiana, and was born in the town of Vevay, of that State. His father was a Virginian. The son began life as a "Hooper teacher," and then went into the pulpit as a Methodist preacher. Becoming fond of literary pursuits, and writing some popular works of fiction, he went to New York, where he has succeeded very well.

We readily make the correction, for old Virginia has children enough without claiming those of other States. We would that she were able to swoop off some of her prodigals for such men as Mr. EGLESTON, but that can't be, and she must get along as well as possible with her unprofitable scions, consoling herself as she will by remembering the legion of brave and noble sons who claim her with pride as their honored mother.

The friend who corrected us as to the nativity of Mr. EGLESTON professes to have known well most of the characters in his story of "Roxey," and thinks them drawn with great fidelity, especially the bluff old English shoemaker who hammered leather many years and then studied law and went to hammering litigations and pinching witnesses. It is rare that shoemakers, who are naturally pacific and love quiet, become lawyers. A noted case in this State in the beginning of this century was that of the famous DANIEL SNEYDY, who rose to the front rank of the legal profession. EGLESTON'S lawyer was no drawback to the fraternity to which he belonged.

THEY ALL COME TO ROOST.—The rather famous Colonel DANIELS, who once edited the State Journal, Republican paper in this city, who, like a kite, has gotten possession of that eagle's nest—Gunston Hall—has received grateful letters from the "boss stone-cutter" Murch, of Maine, thanking him for the great service he rendered in helping out his election to Congress as a successor to HALE, of Maine. We are not surprised that DANIELS helped the "boss." He is just the man to help both BUTLER and the "boss" upon an opportunity. The Alexandria Gazette speaks truly of this Colonel DANIELS:

"The Colonel has cut loose entirely from the Republican party, and is now aloof on the ground of the party that has for its object the demonization of gold and the depreciation of paper-money; and which, if successful, may make labor worth five or ten paper-dollars a day, but the five or ten earned will not buy as much meat and bread as one dollar does now. Greenbackism, in every other sense, is possible in New England, and with confidence from the North like Colonel DANIELS; but how people who have had experience with Confederate money can favor an unlimited and irredeemable currency is hard to understand."

The School Exam.—Under the decision of the Court of Appeals, which gives the tax-payers the right to pay in coupons as well for school as for other purposes, there is not enough money to support both the Government and the schools. This is the upshot of the whole matter.—Winchester Times.

The Court of Appeals said that they would not then assume the duty of raising money to support the public schools, and therefore held that the school-fund taxes might be paid in coupons. But in view of the fact that the Legislature has neglected its duty, the Court might now reach a different conclusion.

Miss POLLY MAHONEY and the Widow BUTLER are fast friends.

(For the Dispatch.)

The illustrious Senator from Manchester, Mr. CHURCH, has been spending over the district his novel financial views, and has analyzed the mental attributes of General Joe Johnston. Captain John S. Wise met him recently at some place in Chesterfield—"Squire" ought to have been the place, whether it was or not—and in the course of his relation to the Senator pointed out his own financial views, and the Senator concluded to this effect: "If, with his liberal education, his association with the great men of the age, his public services and experiences, General Johnston is no statesman, what the hell are you?"

The Public-School Fund.

(For the Dispatch.)

As one deeply interested in the preservation of our present system of public schools, I most respectfully ask a short space in the columns of your very valuable paper for the insertion of this article, containing a few inquiries of all responsible State officers in regard to the condition of the system.

1. Are the laws regulating and making provision for the support and maintenance of the public schools being carried out?

2. Are the teachers of the schools, or the people of the State, who are beyond all question interested in the strict execution and enforcement of the laws in regard to them, being fairly and honestly dealt with?

There are certain funds which, by our State Constitution, are set apart for the support of these schools alone; which, if applied as the Constitution has directed and prescribed, would, we believe, have been adequate for this purpose. For some years ago the schools were put in operation in the State, the teachers, after rendering their services, had no difficulty in getting the stipulated compensation, which was paid almost immediately upon becoming due. If, however, they had to wait any length of time for payment, which was seldom the case, and they happened to be pressed pecuniarily, their school orders were as good as nothing for money purposes or money itself. Our merchants would take them in exchange for merchandise. Any of our people handling a little surplus money upon them, &c. How is it now? For two or three years past, the teachers have been unable to find a person, a trader of any kind, who would think of taking one at all except at a most enormous discount. Why is this? Persons taking them have had to wait so long before getting the money, and sometimes they have not been able to get it at all, that they have not cared to have anything whatever to do with them. Thus it is that the teacher, who great soever his need may be, finds it absolutely impossible to make these orders available to him in any way, and is compelled to look to them, as a means of subsistence, and to do so in patience in awaiting the entire pleasure of the Government in the matter of payment after his service has been performed, notwithstanding the express stipulation in the contract for his services, if I mistake not, that the money shall be paid him at the expiration of each month. In some instances teachers of these schools have no other occupation. They haven't time to do anything else for a living. At the very time they might and would resort to something to do, and to get some money, they are engaged in teaching, and are consequently entirely dependent upon their salaries for a living. They have to live; they need food and raiment as well as other people. If they don't raise such things as they need to eat, they must buy them. If the Government will not pay them, they have lost the chance to raise these things by engaging in its service with vain expectations of payment, how are they to get them at all? They frequently have a chance to buy country produce, which they need, at tolerably reduced prices, if they only had the money to buy it. But the Government is withholding it, and they lose the chance. Corn, for instance, which all country people particularly need, when first put upon the market in the fall sells at from one dollar and a half to two dollars per barrel. Often at the time the teacher can get his money to invest in that article it has gone up to two dollars and a half, three dollars, and often three and a half; and all other country produce which he needs, and is obliged to have, just in the same proportion. One hundred and fifty dollars per annum, which is the salary of this country teacher, can't enable a single one of us to live like a prince, as you doubtless well know. Messrs. Editors, if this sum be all the poor teacher has to buy with, and he has the very highest prices to pay for everything he needs, but that, at the time he can get it, he has to hard down in this world of ours, and maintaining a desperate struggle against starvation and nakedness, with no pleasing prospect of coming off "conqueror at last." Do you think so?

Can you then—can those State officials who look upon all opportunities for information upon this subject tell us—why it is that the teacher is kept out of his honest dues in this way? Where and what the reason and authority for withholding so long from him that which he is entitled to? Can you tell us why he has to have when it becomes due? What has become of the funds set apart by the organic law for school purposes alone? Our County Superintendent of Schools was in Richmond a short time since, and while there went to the office of the State Superintendent, Dr. W. J. H. LEE, and there he was upon this subject. The Doctor happened to be out, and our Superintendent did not see him, but learned from a source which he seemed to regard as reliable that the State Auditor's books showed that \$1,000,000 of the money set apart for school purposes had been applied to some other purpose, and such application was by authority of our State Legislature, every one of whom when sworn into office solemnly swore to carry out the provisions of the State Constitution.

Is not the Constitution the ultimate and supreme law of the State? Is it not the duty of sufficient importance to the people at large to be noticed or embraced in organic law? If so, what authority has our State Legislature to say that any fund set apart by that instrument for a specific purpose shall or can be applied to any other use, or that any instrument which prescribes the method of its own execution, remain unaltered in this respect?

If such misapplication was without the color of authority claimed for it, how is it that it has never been inquired into by our Legislature, a large majority of whom are representatives of a party that was founded upon all such State support upon this subject. The Doctor happened to be out, and our Superintendent did not see him, but learned from a source which he seemed to regard as reliable that the State Auditor's books showed that \$1,000,000 of the money set apart for school purposes had been applied to some other purpose, and such application was by authority of our State Legislature, every one of whom when sworn into office solemnly swore to carry out the provisions of the State Constitution.

Is not the Constitution the ultimate and supreme law of the State? Is it not the duty of sufficient importance to the people at large to be noticed or embraced in organic law? If so, what authority has our State Legislature to say that any fund set apart by that instrument for a specific purpose shall or can be applied to any other use, or that any instrument which prescribes the method of its own execution, remain unaltered in this respect?

If such misapplication was without the color of authority claimed for it, how is it that it has never been inquired into by our Legislature, a large majority of whom are representatives of a party that was founded upon all such State support upon this subject. The Doctor happened to be out, and our Superintendent did not see him, but learned from a source which he seemed to regard as reliable that the State Auditor's books showed that \$1,000,000 of the money set apart for school purposes had been applied to some other purpose, and such application was by authority of our State Legislature, every one of whom when sworn into office solemnly swore to carry out the provisions of the State Constitution.

Is not the Constitution the ultimate and supreme law of the State? Is it not the duty of sufficient importance to the people at large to be noticed or embraced in organic law? If so, what authority has our State Legislature to say that any fund set apart by that instrument for a specific purpose shall or can be applied to any other use, or that any instrument which prescribes the method of its own execution, remain unaltered in this respect?

If such misapplication was without the color of authority claimed for it, how is it that it has never been inquired into by our Legislature, a large majority of whom are representatives of a party that was founded upon all such State support upon this subject. The Doctor happened to be out, and our Superintendent did not see him, but learned from a source which he seemed to regard as reliable that the State Auditor's books showed that \$1,000,000 of the money set apart for school purposes had been applied to some other purpose, and such application was by authority of our State Legislature, every one of whom when sworn into office solemnly swore to carry out the provisions of the State Constitution.

Is not the Constitution the ultimate and supreme law of the State? Is it not the duty of sufficient importance to the people at large to be noticed or embraced in organic law? If so, what authority has our State Legislature to say that any fund set apart by that instrument for a specific purpose shall or can be applied to any other use, or that any instrument which prescribes the method of its own execution, remain unaltered in this respect?

If such misapplication was without the color of authority claimed for it, how is it that it has never been inquired into by our Legislature, a large majority of whom are representatives of a party that was founded upon all such State support upon this subject. The Doctor happened to be out, and our Superintendent did not see him, but learned from a source which he seemed to regard as reliable that the State Auditor's books showed that \$1,000,000 of the money set apart for school purposes had been applied to some other purpose, and such application was by authority of our State Legislature, every one of whom when sworn into office solemnly swore to carry out the provisions of the State Constitution.

because of a deficiency of the school funds. If this be so, of course only a third of the children can be taught, and thus the parents of these children will really derive no benefit from the tax that all have to pay for the support of these schools. Can this be right? When all have to pay the tax, ought not all who have children that they wish to send to school to share in the benefit it confers? And when none of them are to be benefited, ought they pay a tax for the support of the schools, and then have to be disappointed? Editors, will you ever in this State who feels any interest in the preservation of our system of public schools was looking into these matters and taking some action in regard to them? Unless something be done very soon to our school system will condition of things at our schools be worse. It can't possibly be kept up in this way. Ought it to be kept up, or the children of the State to be educated? The parents of a large majority of them are unable to send them to private schools, and if our system, what our private schools are abolished they must grow up in ignorance. Could such a state of things be contemplated by men of intelligence with a feeling of satisfaction and security for the future of our grand old Commonwealth? Does not the prospect of such a state of things depend too much upon the amount of intelligence in its members for them to fail to avail themselves of every possible means to promote the cause of education? Though this is a great and important truth taught us by both history and experience, yet it seems to me to be one which our system of education should have either never learned or duly appreciated.

JOHN JOHNSON.—General Joe Johnson has been nominated by the Democrats for Congress in the Richmond (Va.) district. If Richmond fails to send this grand old hero to Congress the merchants of the South should never buy another bit of goods in that city.—Winston (N. C.) Sentinel.

MARRIAGES.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

JUDGE CRITCHER DRUBBED.—At King and Queen Court-house yesterday week Judge Critcher and General Butler spoke at the same place, and the first and third, General Beale then replied to Judge Critcher in a speech of an hour, and of all the drubbings that ever a man got upon the hustings that administered to Critcher in that reply was the severest. We felt sorry for him, although he must have known that he was being drubbed before our people is one that must submit him to treatment mortifying to a man of sense, education, and refinement, such as Judge Critcher undoubtedly is.

In conclusion General Beale said: I do go down in the dust. I only ask to be buried wrapped in the Conservative flag, with only this inscription upon my gravestone: Here lies the man whom no open foe destroyed, but who met his death at the hand of a deserter.—West Point Star.

MR. T. T. FAUNTIER NOT A CANDIDATE. Mr. T. T. Fauntier, of Winchester, who was a brief visitor yesterday, and while here was asked the question, by a Times reporter, whether or not he was an independent candidate in the present campaign for Congress, has been reported by individuals and stated by some newspapers to be a candidate. Mr. Fauntier replied that he was not a candidate.—Culpeper Times, 18th.

JOE JOHNSON.—General Joe Johnson has been nominated by the Democrats for Congress in the Richmond (Va.) district. If Richmond fails to send this grand old hero to Congress the merchants of the South should never buy another bit of goods in that city.—Winston (N. C.) Sentinel.

MARRIAGES.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September 17th, by the Rev. Edmund Withers, father of the bridegroom, THOMAS WITHERS of the bridegroom, and FRANK J. HUNTER of the late distinguished Matthew F. Maury.

Married, in this city, on Wednesday, September 18, 1878, by Rev. J. B. HUNTER, assisted by Rev. George J. HAY, Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district. Mr. H. H. HUNTER, of the office of the Richmond (Va.) district.

Married, in Richmond, on Tuesday, September